

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheets of drawings include simple corrections to Figures 1 and 7 to amend the text to fit the figures. These were the only corrections made to the figures, done per the drafter's suggestions; no substantive changes were made, and no new matter was added. These sheets, which include Figures 1 and 7, replace the original sheets, and are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed March 21, 2005 ("the Office Action"), Applicants respectfully request that the Office enter the amendments set forth above and consider the following remarks. By this response, claims 1-6, 9-11, and 13-16 have been amended, and claims 17-20 have been added. Thus, after entry of this paper, claims 1-20 will be pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner: (i) objected to textual informalities in the drawings; (ii) objected to an informality in the specification; (iii) objected to an informality in Claim 11; (iv) rejected claims 1-2 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,260,043 to Puri et al. ("Puri"); (v) rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Puri in view of "SDMI Portable Device Specification, Part 1, Version 1.0" ("SDMI"); (vi) rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,662,365 to Sullivan et al ("Sullivan"); (vii) rejected claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,491 to Lion ("Lion"); (viii) rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI further in view of Lion and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,982,898 to Hsu et al. ("Hsu"); and (ix) and rejected claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI further in view of Sullivan and further in view of Lion and Hsu.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above rejections for the reasons set forth below.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to Figures 1 and 7 because of textual informalities. Applicants have amended the drawings in the manner recommended by the Examiner, and respectfully submit that the Examiner's objections have been overcome.

Objection to the Specification

Applicants thank the Examiner for noting the inadvertent error in the specification. Applicants have amended the specification in the manner recommended by the Examiner, and thus respectfully submit that the Examiner's objection has been overcome. Applicants have also amended the specification to capitalize the trademarks referred to therein, as recommended by the Examiner, and to more accurately cross-reference certain related applications.

Objection to Claim 11

Applicants thank the Examiner for noting the inadvertent error in claim 11. Applicants have amended claim 11 in the manner recommended by the Examiner, and thus respectfully submit that the Examiner's objection has been overcome.

Rejection of Claims 1-2 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-2 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Puri. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over Puri, for at least the reasons set forth below.

With regard to claim 1, although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection, Applicants have nonetheless amended claim 1 and respectfully submit that it is even more clearly allowable over Puri. In particular, Applicants respectively submit that Puri does not teach the use of digital certificates, as recited in amended claim 1. Nor does Puri teach the use of an electronic rule associated with a piece of electronic content, the electronic rule including data specifying one or more conditions associated with rendering the piece of electronic content, including a condition that the piece of electronic content may be rendered by an application program having a first digital certificate associated therewith. Puri further fails to teach the examination of data included in the electronic rule to determine the conditions specified therein.

Instead, Puri discloses a fundamentally different process, namely, the conversion of one file format to another. Nowhere does Puri teach or suggest the use of digital certificates or electronic rules, as recited in Applicants' claim 1. To the extent the Examiner previously interpreted the file structure and/or file extensions taught by Puri to inherently define a rule, Applicants respectfully submit that even if this could be construed as a type of "rule," it is not the type recited in Applicants' amended claim 1, namely, a rule including data explicitly specifying certain conditions associated with rendering a piece of content, conditions that are explicitly examined before rendering of the content occurs. The "inherent rule" allegedly taught by Puri is, at best, an intangible quality of the file itself, not a tangible piece of data separately associated with the file that specifies conditions associated with rendering the file, including a condition that the file may be rendered by an application program having a first digital

certificate associated therewith. In addition, Applicants have amended claim 1 to further clarify that the data included in the rule is examined to determine the conditions specified therein. No such explicit examination is taught by Puri.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Puri. Claims 2 and 16 are dependent on claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI. Claim 3 is ultimately dependent on claim 1. Further, the deficiencies of Puri noted above in connection with claim 1 are not cured by SDMI. Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable over these references for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Rejection of Claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI and further in view of Sullivan. Claims 4 and 5 are ultimately dependent on claim 1. Further, the deficiencies of Puri noted above in connection with claim 1 are not cured by SDMI or Sullivan, taken alone or together. Accordingly, claims 4 and 5 are allowable over these references for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Rejection of Claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI and further in view of Lion. Claims 6-8 are ultimately dependent on claim 1. Further, the deficiencies of Puri noted above in connection with claim 1 are not cured by SDMI or Lion, taken alone or together. Accordingly, claims 6-8 are allowable over these references for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI further in view of Lion and further in view of Hsu. Claim 9 is ultimately dependent on claim 1. Further, the deficiencies of Puri noted above in connection with claim 1 are not cured by SDMI, Lion or Hsu, taken alone or together. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over these references for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Rejection of Claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Puri in view of SDMI further in view of Sullivan and further in view of Lion and Hsu. Claims 10-15 are ultimately dependent on claim 1. Further, the deficiencies of Puri noted above in connection with claim 1 are not cured by SDMI,

Sullivan, Lion, or Hsu, taken alone or together. Accordingly, claims 10-15 are allowable over these references for at least the same reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claims 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

New Claims 17-20

New claims 17-20 have been added to further round out the scope of protection of Applicants' invention. Each of claims 17-20 is supported by the specification text and/or drawings as initially filed and no new matter has been added.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in allowable form, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 21, 2005

By: 
Andrew B. Schwaab
Reg. No. 38,611

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
901 New York Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Attorney direct (650) 849-6643

Attachments: Exhibit A - Drawing Sheets